| 9b. Did the fielding command assemble a material requirements list in a standard MRL format IAW DA Pam 700-142 | YES | NO | N/A |
|---|-----|----|-----|
| and submit it to the gaining command for review 30 days prior to the format coordination. | | | |
| c. Did the coordination package identify the following separate authorized requirements? (1) EI/WS | | | |
| (2) ASIOE | | | |
| (3) OSE (for unit activations/conversion) | | | |
| (4) Initial Issue Class IX or combination list for TDA units (e.g., TRADOC schools) with MPL designated where applicable. | | | |
| (5) STTE. | | | |
| (6) TMDE, to include TPS and interconnecting devices, when applicable. | | | |
| (7) SPECIAL MISSION KITS/REQUIREMENTS (e.g. BLACKOUTS KITS, FABRICATED OR MANUFACTURED ITEMS, AND ASSEMBLED ITEMS.) | | | |
| (8) Are warranteed items indicated on the MRL? | 1 | | |
| (9) Publications. | | | |
| (10) Deployable CTA items (for unit activations/conversions.) | + | | |
| (11) Were specially controlled commodities identified in the total Materiel Requirements List, and | | | |
| available in the supply system? (a) AMMO | | | |
| (b) Bulk POL. | | | |
| (c) Class VII | | | |
| (12) Discretionary items are not part of TPF. Was the unit provided a list of discretionary items that may be requisitioned? | | | |
| d. Has the gaining command requisitioned the required materiel to be available at the staging site at date of handoff? | | | |
| (1) Class III | | | |
| (2) Class V | | | |
| (3) Class VIII | | | |
| e. Has required COMSEQ equipment been coordinated with USACSLA and will it be available to support the fielding? | | | |
| f. Have physical security requirements been identified? | | | |
| g. During the coordination meeting, were the following areas reviewed/scrubbed? (1) Will NET be provided as part of the fielding? | | | |
| (2) Will the MTOE with the E-DATE closest to fielding be utilized to compute MRL? | | | |
| (3) Will the current approved unit MTOE be in place 340 days prior to handoff (Encl 2)? | | | |
| (4) MFP vs MTOE. | | | |
| (5) MSP vs MTOE. | | | |
| (6) MRL vs MTOE. | | | |
| (7) Did the MRL identify those items currently on hand in the unit, that should not be furnished as part of the total package? | | | |
| h. Has all available excess equipment been identified? | | | |
| . Is a material transfer plan required for disposition of displaced equipment? | | | |
| . Was gaining command/unit's required documentation package identified for each unit? | 1 | | |
| Was the required assistance and support to be provided by the fielding command identified and made a matter of record? | | | |
| Did the assistance/support include: (1) Providing a list of items to the gaining command not readily available in the supply system? | | | |
| (2) Determining if items not available in the supply system could be furnished by the gaining command. | | | |

| | (3) Advising the gaining command that it fielding command for Out-of-DAMPL | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | YES | NO | N/A | | |
|--------|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------|--------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | |
| l. | Was a staging/handoff site identified and | coordinated between th | e fielding and gaining command? | | | | | |
| m. | Was a coordinated handoff date determin | red? | | | | | | |
| n. | Was a Memo for Record developed by th assistaince and support required and to be | | | | | | | |
| | As a mininum, this should include: (1) Deprocessing. | | | | | | | |
| | (2) Operational checks. | | | | | | | |
| | (3) Coordinated inventory. | | | | | | | |
| | (4) Assistance in establishing retain sup | ply records. | | | | | | |
| | (5) Required facilities/equipments to incl | ude operational test area | S. | | | | | |
| | (6) P.O.L. requirements. | | | | | | | |
| _ | (7) Calibration support | | | | | | | |
| | (8) Is any portion of the total package c | overed under the warran | ty program? | | | | | |
| | | | hed by fielding command cancelled during the | | | | | |
| | HOW WILL GAINING COMMAND TRACK | PACKAGE? | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| q. | Did the fielding command provide the ga publications? | ining command with a lis | t of all required technical | | | | | |
| | Was the gaining unit advised of the impormeetings, message traffic and telephone o | | audit trail on all transactions to include all | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | ARE ANY SUBSEQUENT COORDINATION | MEETINGS PLANNED? | F YES, GIVE DATES AND POC's. | | | | | |
| 5. | The signatures below signify that the will ensure a complete and timely field | | meeting has been held and an audit trail h | as been e | stablishe | d that | | |
| TY | PED NAME OF FIELDING COMMAND REPR | ESENTATIVE | TYPED NAME OF GAINING COMMAND REPF | PED NAME OF GAINING COMMAND REPRESENTATIVE | | | | |
| SIC | NATURE | DATE | SIGNATURE | DATE | | | | |